

Planning Commission Minutes of February 28, 2003
7:30 PM Council Chambers
City Hall
401 N. Main Ave.

In Attendance:

Kent Elliott
Clinton Sigmon
Brevard Arndt
Stan Winstead

Members Absent:

Tony Jarrett
Judy Ikerd
Gary Corne

Chairman Arndt asked for Consideration of the minutes of the January 28, 2003 meeting. There being no corrections or additions, he ruled that the minutes are approved as presented.

Item 4: Old Business

Mr. Arndt recognized **Glenn Pattishall** for presentation on area specific plan #1. **Mr. Pattishall** reviewed detail statistical information concerning the area specific plan's study area. He gave a breakdown of the different acreages and the zoning classes of the district stating that there was a total of 54,597 acres of commercial zoning, 313,699 acres of industrial zoning. The remainder being residential in its various forms. He stated that there were a total of 1,938.58 acres of which 1,249.82 were in the city, 688.75 were in the city's extra territorial planning jurisdiction. He review statistics on land use by type, essentially covering residential, manufacturing, commercial, office institution, open space, vacant, and road rights of way. He stated that there were three drainage basins; Smyre Creek with 166 acres, Town Creek with 1,077 acres, and Macklin Creek with 694 acres. He said of that, there was a total of 80 acres in the flood plane with .53 acres in the established wet lands. He said that there were 591 total water meters in the area, 519 of which were inside the city, 72 which were outside. **Mr. Pattishall** said that since the December meeting he had the opportunity to meet with both Scott Millar, President of Catawba County Economic Development Corporation and John Tippet, the MPO Transportation Planner. He stated that the packet included the comments from each of them concerning the study area specific plan for area #1. He also mentioned that there was an attachment to Mr. Millar's comments specifically related to Foresight, the Future Forwards study, and the Priority One Forum. He stated that there would be potential target clusters of various types of industries and business in the future, that the Planning Commission should take into account as they put together the area specific plan.

Mr. Pattishall then reviewed demographic information for the area. He stated that the source of the information was the U.S. Census for both 1990 and 2000. As compiled by the Western Piedmont COG. Data Center. **Mr. Pattishall** said that the person per household for the ASP #1 was higher than the city overall. Statistics indicated that it was growing at a slower rate than the city as a whole. There was a larger percentage of

minority population in the area. That the age of the population essentially was about the same. The median age was approximately the same, however there were more young people as a percentage of the population in the study area than in the city as a whole. He said that the statistics indicated that housing tenure was more stable housing tenure in the study area than the city as a whole. There was about equal immigration, but a little slower than the city as a whole. With regard to commuting times from the study area, most people worked closer to home than the remainder of the population in the city, based on commuting times and percent of employees employed outside the county of residents. He said that the statistics indicated that there were less professional people living in the study area, that the majority were manufacturing workers. He said that household income appeared to be a little lower than that of the city as a whole. Housing costs were lower indicating that it was the choice area for affordable housing, and suggested that this may be impacted by the number of mobile homes that are in the area. Looking at the value of housing, there was approximately \$2,000- \$3,000 difference between the median housing value of the city overall as apposed to the study area in the study area. He said that the COG's analysis indicated that the study area was not projected to grow very fast. However he said that factors that would affect the projections would be extensions of utilities in the area, completions of the loop, and the land use policies that the Planning Commission and Council would decide on for this area.

Mr. Pattishall reviewed some action items that needed to be taken care of prior to a community workshop being established for the study area. Quite a few involved mapping, meeting with property owners, and other parties at interest. He said that he would be perusing this in the future as time and staffing would allow as he is currently trying to hire someone to replace a code enforcement officer position.

He reviewed the ideas for community drop in workshop to gauge the Planning Commission's feelings on this. **Mr. Arndt** said that he felt that the staff should talk with some of the larger property owners in the area before the workshop to see what their plans were. He also suggested that the staff work closer with EDC to establish the types of industries and businesses that we would want to recruit for the area. He questioned if commercial development should occur on the Moose Property at the intersection of the loop and NC 16. He said that the Planning Commission should be considering where more people would go for food, shopping, and other services in the area, and would like for the staff to evaluate this. **Mr. Arndt** expressed his concern for access to the Moose Estate and suggested that the staff talked to NCDOT about access management recommendations for the loop and NC16.

Mr. Elliott suggested that the drop in meeting could be held at a church in the area.

Discussion of Sidewalk Standards

Mr. Pattishall said that the packet included various standards for sidewalk requirements. He said that the attachments showed different cross sections for the different types of city streets. After general discussion, **Mr. Pattishall** said that at the next meeting he would have a map would show existing schools, shopping centers, park land, sidewalks, community and civic facilities which would include: City Hall, the Court House, Library, and Government Center, and concentrations of high density residential multi-family development for the planning commission to consider.

Item 5: New Business- Consideration of text amendment parking standards of Amusement Arcade.

Mr. Pattishall reviewed his February 21, 2003 memo concerning parking standards for Amusement Arcade. He reviewed a survey that he conducted for various cities in the region. He said that an individual interested in moving their current amusement arcade to a new facility found that the facility is approximately 5,000 square feet and that the ordinance would require them to have 50 parking spaces. The current site has approximately 20 parking spaces. He said that the question in his mind was; is ten parking spaces per 1,000 of gross floor area a reasonable standard? He said that as a result of his analysis, there was only one community, Hickory that has the same standard. All others were different. Some based on number of seats, others allowed by individual review, some based on a smaller number of parking spaces per thousand square feet of gross floor area. He also mentioned occupancy load.

Mr. Winstead had suggested that is should be tied to occupancy in terms of the number of parking spaces. He explained that the floor area used for pool tables and game equipment should not be counted towards floor area in parking space requirements.

Mr. Arndt said that he was ok with occupancy basis, but some buildings are not suited for occupancy due to a lack of parking spaces and how would that apply specifically in the central business district? **Mr. Pattishall** said that it would not apply to central business district since there were no required parking spaces. After general discussion, **Mr. Winstead** recommended that the staff draft a text amendment for consideration for the next Planning Commission meeting and there was consensus of the Planning Commission that this be done and a public hearing be held.

Item 6: Reports

Mr. Pattishall reviewed recent City Council action the January permit and planner's report. With no further business appearing the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Glenn J. Pattishall/AICP
Secretary